

## **Minutes of the EIIP Mobile Sources Committee January 2001 Conference Call**



Date of Call: January 9, 2001

Attendees: Rob Altenburg, PA Department of Environmental Protection  
Laurel Driver, U.S. EPA/Emission Factor & Inventory Group  
Dennis Beauregard, U.S. EPA/Emission Factor & Inventory Group  
Janet Cohen, U.S. EPA/Office of Transportation & Air Quality  
John Koupal, U.S. EPA/Office of Transportation & Air Quality  
Mark Janssen, Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium  
Holli Ensz, Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality  
Doug Lawson, National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
Carla Bedenbaugh, South Carolina Dept. of Health & Environmental Control  
Lynn Allen, South Carolina Dept. of Health & Environmental Control  
Ran MacDonald, Utah Division of Air Quality  
Allen Ostrander, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality  
Richard McElveen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Maggie Pomatto, Delaware Natural Resources & Environmental Control  
Sheri Walz, Iowa Department of Natural Resources  
Sam Wells, Starcrest Consulting Group  
Cyril Durrenberger, Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission  
Kim Livo, Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment  
Sandeep Kishan, Eastern Research Group  
Garry Brooks, Eastern Research Group

The meeting began with Laurel Driver explaining that the Mobile Sources Committee (MSC) now has contractor support in place to assist with Committee organization, communication, and technical information needs. This support will be provided by Eastern Research Group (ERG) and Garry Brooks will be the ERG contact for the MSC.

During the next phase of the agenda, Dennis Beauregard provided an update on the status of progress in establishing contract funding mechanisms with Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs) for the purpose of managing MSC technical projects. Dennis indicated he and other Steering Committee members had talked with several RPOs about getting involved with the MSC projects. The two most likely RPOs to participate with the MSC at this time are the Lake Michigan Air Directors Consortium (LADCO) and the Central States Regional Air Planning Association (CENRAP). Of the three projects currently under consideration, LADCO has offered to manage the Top-Down Validation Study and CENRAP has agreed to handle both the Onroad and Non-road Mobile Best Practices projects. At this time, Dennis is working with the Grant Officers in EPA Regions 5 and 6 to prepare appropriate grant language. The Grant

Officers are being very cooperative and once grant language can be finalized, grant applications will be solicited from the grantees (i.e., RPOs). Central to finalizing the grants is to get final scopes of work for each project.

Some discussion was held on the role of the RPOs and the MSC subcommittees in implementing the three projects. It was agreed that the subcommittees should continue to provide technical input and oversight to the RPOs once the projects are underway. Basically, the subcommittee role does not end once the RPO initiates the project. The RPOs also want OTAQ input and review. Mark Janssen indicated that he would also like to have the subcommittees involved in reviewing proposals that come into the RPOs from contractors, and where it makes sense, assist with tasks to implement the various projects. He reemphasized that the RPOs will not be doing all the work on these projects, instead they are mainly conduits to getting the work done.

Rob Altenburg asked a question concerning the level of detail that the scopes of work being prepared by the subcommittees should strive for. He questioned whether they should be general or as detailed and specific as the subcommittee can make them. Dennis commented that at this point, the more detail the better, but the subcommittees should not hold them up to keep trying to be more specific. The urgency now is to establish a reasonable level of detail and get the scopes into the Grant Officers. They may modify them anyway as they see fit to adhere to their normal grant process. Rob also questioned what the time line was for getting the scopes to the Grant Officers and then getting the RPOs online. Dennis answered that while there was no exact time line, he expected that the scopes of work would be sent to the Grant Officers within 2-3 weeks from when he received them.

Dennis asked a question of the Non-road subcommittee concerning the draft scope of work that had been circulated for a project involving aircraft, locomotives, and marine vessels. He questioned if this was in fact a fourth MSC project, and indicated he felt the scope needed to be developed a bit further. Ran MacDonald responded that this project is now going to be the Non-road subcommittee's project. The previous project directed at the NONROAD model is being tabled. The scope for the aircraft/locomotive/vessel project has been enhanced and was distributed today just before the call.

A question was asked concerning the budget that was available for each MSC project. Someone indicated that they thought a figure of \$80,000 had been earmarked for each study. Rob said he thought the starting figure for the actual studies was \$60,000 each, with the other \$20,000 kept in reserve to cover things like other contractor support, RPO fees, and other overhead items. The total came to \$80,000 but each initial study was only \$60,000. There wasn't clear agreement on this. It was pointed out that each subcommittee also needed to come up with an estimate of the level of resources its project would require. It was agreed that final budgets need to be established soon. Cyril pointed out that if a particular group felt its work needed more than the amount of budget currently available, they should make a case for additional funds to the EIIP Steering Committee.

The meeting then moved into a discussion of the three subcommittee projects. Prior to this though, Rob asked if there had been a decision made on whether the three projects were supposed to address toxics or not. Dennis responded that for now, the projects should hold off on addressing toxics. The reason for this involves the toxics scoping study being proposed across all EIIP projects. This effort will look at toxics from all source types and try to evaluate gross emissions, toxicity of constituent pollutants, and the uncertainty associated with these data. The goal will be to determine a relative hazard ranking to help prioritize sources and pollutants in terms of the risk they pose to ambient air quality.

Doug Lawson of the National Renewable Energy Lab commented that his group was also involved in research programs that will produce valuable information for the assessment of toxics emissions and air quality. They are conducting a large toxicity study involving gasoline and diesel fuel vehicles. Onroad and non-road vehicles will be tested, including high emitter vehicles. Vehicle emissions will be speciated and analyzed for toxicity. Doug also mentioned an EC diesel study in southern California and a CRC air toxics modeling study as being potentially useful for toxics evaluations.

Mark Janssen lead the discussion of progress for the Top-Down validation subcommittee. He indicated that the group had not had any calls in the last four months, but he hoped to have a meeting of the group within the next two weeks. One significant new development has occurred that impacts the planned top-down validation project. The Coordinating Research Council (CRC) is conducting a project that essentially duplicates what the MSC top-down project was going to do. This portion of what the MSC was going to do needs to be redesigned. Mark suggested that perhaps the group could try to design an effort to dovetail with CRC's or go beyond it in some manner. Mark noted that the CRC program is currently waiting for the release of the final MOBILE6 and EMFAC2000 models.

He proposed that one beneficial thing the MSC could try to do would be to provide guidance to states on how to address model problems that are identified by the CRC study. This would allow the states to be better equipped to use the models for their locale. This kind of effort would be an example of going beyond what CRC is planning on doing. Doug Lawson suggested that the group may want to give the available budget of this subcommittee to the CRC study contractors and have them give the MSC the outputs it desires. Cyril voiced concern to make sure the CRC program does not just focus on California issues, validation needs to be looked at for more areas across the country. Mark said he had heard other areas like Houston, Atlanta, the Northeast corridor, and the LADCO domain mentioned as possible study areas.

Mark stated he would like to have a group call either January 22 or 23. The subcommittee will produce a final top-down validation scope of work soon after that meeting. Janet Cohen and John Koupal of OTAQ indicated they would like to be a part of the next group call.

The discussion on the Non-road mobile subcommittee project was lead by Ran MacDonald. Ran reemphasized that the current project the group is proposing to conduct involves an assessment of aircraft, locomotives, and commercial marine vessels. They want to investigate the use of locality-specific activity to build bottom-up emissions estimates. They propose to build an Internet resource web page that can be linked to the EIIP main page.

Janet pointed out that for aircraft, a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) tool is being developed which OTAQ supports as a good method to use for emission estimates. For this reason, she recommended dropping aircraft as one of the categories this subcommittee would include in its scope of work. Janet stated that the tool is capable of addressing emissions in terms of day of the week and hour of the day variations. In response to a question, she noted that this product will be an actual estimation tool and not just general guidance. It will not be structured like the old NEVES study. She was not sure of the release date for the FAA product, but she thinks it is within this year and possibly within the next six months. It will not come out as any kind of OTAQ product she said. Rich Wilcox at OTAQ is coordinating with FAA on the tool.

Ran ended this discussion by scheduling a Non-road subcommittee call for Tuesday, January 16 at 11am EST. He invited Janet and others at OTAQ to participate in the meeting.

Sam Wells then presented the discussion for the Onroad mobile subcommittee. Sam commented that he was standing in for George Dresser who could not make the call and was reporting some notes that George had provided. Sam noted that not much had changed with this group's project outline for the onroad best practices work since the last outline was sent around. This subcommittee also needs to meet again soon to better cement its thoughts. Sam reiterated that the mission of this group was not to evaluate or critique the mobile emission models. Instead, the onroad best practices effort is trying to bridge the gap between the mobile emission models and the transportation demand models. They are actually more focused on assessing the transportation activity aspects of onroad mobile emissions (e.g., variables such as speed and temperature). Sam went on to list several topics that the group had for possible study.

- operating mode VMT fractions
- sensitivity of emission rates to travel activities
- VMT mix (e.g., no. of SUVs)
- day of week issues
- improved understanding of mobile inventory budgets for SIPs relative to conformity issues
- effect of speed limit changes
- travel demand modeling
- onroad mobile issues in photochemical modeling

Mark Janssen commented, that through LADCO's work, they have seen that diurnal day of week differences are very important when it comes to the photochemical modeling. These kinds of changes can have significant impacts in modeling results across different geographic areas.

John Koupal announced that there would be a FACA meeting on January 16 as part of an effort OTAQ is conducting to look past MOBILE6 and into new ideas for evaluating mobile source emissions in the future. He would like for some of the EIIP MSC members to attend the meeting if possible. They can call in to the meeting. Sam Wells, Rob Altenburg, and Mark Janssen indicated possible interest in attending. Doug Lawson also noted that the CRC Annual Workshop would be held in San Diego at the end of March, and commented that this is one of the best meetings in the country on mobile source issues.

The date and time of the next MSC conference call was set for **Tuesday, February 6 from 2:00-3:00 pm EST**. A call-in number for the meeting will be sent out before the call as part of an agenda announcement.